

| ICF Comment # | Date Received | Chapter/ Appendix | Page(s) | Line(s) |
|---------------|---------------|-------------------|---------|----------------|
| 1417 | 7/3/13 | 5 | 5-4 | 24 |
| 1418 | 7/3/13 | 5 | 5-85 | Also table 5-7 |
| 1419 | 7/3/13 | 5 | 5-11 | 8-15 |
| 1420 | 7/3/13 | 5 | 5-11 | 8-15 |

| Comment | Agency | Agency Type |
|---|--------|-------------|
| Information about water demand and population growth should be expanded to describe the relationship between water demand and population growth and the reasons it is assumed that demand will grow. Similarly, a discussion about agricultural water use and estimated future changes in the use of SWP/CVP water is also appropriate to describe. This information would also be very useful as support for the Need Statement in Chapter 2. | USEPA | Cooperating |
| North of Delta M&I would increase up to 85% compared to existing conditions. This seems like a very large increase from past trends, and further explanation and support is needed for such an increase. If this is related to population growth, that should be explained here, too (related to table 30-6). And is this 85% increase included in the No Action as well as Alt 4? (p. 5-45). | USEPA | Cooperating |
| It may be more straightforward to use the words “shorten the route of Sacramento River Water to the export facilities” instead of “improve the transfer.” Readers not familiar with the system will not understand how the transfer is improved by reading that and the word “transfer” can be confused with “water transfers” which are a very different concept than shortening the route of water from the Sac River to the export facilities. | USEPA | Cooperating |
| It would also be equitable to explain here that there are some negative impacts to the ability of adult San Joaquin River salmon to successfully navigate back to the San Joaquin River when Sacramento River Water is relocated into the south Delta including San Joaquin River channels. | USEPA | Cooperating |

| Response | Comment Type | Status | |
|---|--------------|--------|---|
| Discussion of assumptions for future level of development assumed in CALSIM modeling is summarized in Section 5.3.3.1 and provided in further detail in Appendix 5A. | T | N | We could probably develop a better response or include this information in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Same assumptions apply to all Alternatives simulated at LLT. "buildout of facilities" is indicated. | T | D | |
| Text has been changed to read "to provide a more direct flow route for water entering the Delta from the Sacramento River to the export facilities at the Banks and Jones Pumping Plants" | T | M | |
| This discussion would be located in Chapter 11. | T | N | |

The entries under the “Comment Type” column are as follows:

E – editorial

T – technical items for which the commenter has provided suggested text

I – technical items for which ICF has developed a resolution

P – policy items and/or items that may need further input from the Lead Agencies

The entries under the “Status” column are associated with the following:

D – done as was requested by the commenter

M – done, with some modifications to what was suggested

N – done, with no changes made to the text (but with a draft response)

If the comment has not been resolved yet, the column has been left blank